

DD/S

Approved For Release 2003/06/10 : CIA-RDP78-04302A000100010007-5 57-0193

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

25X1

DOC	<u>5</u>	REV DATE	<u>28/3/80</u>	BY	
ORIG COMP	<u>11</u>	OPI	<u>11</u>	TYPE	<u>OZ</u>
ORIG CLASS	<u>S</u>	PAGES	<u>3</u>	REV CLASS	<u>C</u>
JUST	<u>22</u>	NEXT REV	<u>2010</u>	AUTHI	HR 10-2

22 January 1957

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Training

SUBJECT : Dissent From Majority Recommendations of the Language Development Committee

1. The DD/S representative dissents from recommendations of the majority of the Language Development Committee in the following particulars:

Para 2.b. of [redacted] 14 January draft)
 Para 1 of [redacted] 16 January draft)

2. As approved 17 January 1957, by a majority of the Committee, Para 2.b of [redacted] provides for determination of amounts of awards for various foreign languages as follows:

"b. The Group in which the Language is Classified for Awards Purposes

(1) For award purposes, all languages are arranged in groups for which differing monetary awards are designated. Two criteria govern the classification of the language in any given group, namely, Agency need and the comparative difficulty of the language.

(2) Since Agency need is a changing and not a constant factor it is possible and probable that certain languages may either be added to or shifted from one group to another from time to time. Initially, languages for which awards are authorized are grouped for award purposes as indicated in [redacted]

25X1A

The underscored words reflect the faulty principle to which this dissent is addressed.

3. Since we believe the error to be a fundamental one, it seems appropriate to review the rudiments of the entire concept of this language development program. In brief, they are these:

a. the Agency requires a high incidence and great diversity of language competence among its personnel.

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2003/06/10 : CIA-RDP78-04302A000100010007-5

~~SECRET~~ CONFIDENTIAL

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~
CONFIDENTIAL

b. the quantitative measure of language competence to be acquired is so great that it cannot be achieved solely by directed assignment of personnel to language training duty.

c. official encouragement in the forms of training, tuition for training, cash awards upon achievement of significant competence and, thereafter, for continued maintenance of significant competence, will motivate many staff personnel to acquire language competence on their own time and in addition to their regular duty assignment.

d. since achievement and maintenance awards would be granted in recognition of effort, they should vary in amount in accordance with the relative difficulty of the language.

4. This principle that awards would be granted for effort and would vary in amount directly and only as the languages themselves vary in difficulty of learning, has never before been seriously challenged during the long evolution of the Language Development Program. The principle was accepted from the beginning by the former ad hoc Committee for Language Development appointed by the DD/S in January 1956. It was a fundamental of all staff papers and draft regulations heretofore submitted to the Career Council. Suffice it to say that both [] previously approved by the Career Council, [] which will be considered by the Council 17 January 1957, state that "...Language Development Awards are monetary benefits, granted in recognition of effort to achieve and to maintain language proficiency at awardable levels." 25X1A

5. I would make it clear, however, that the difference between my * views and those of the majority of this Committee is not based on mere reverence for or comfortable adherence to former judgments. Those who advocated varying the amount of award with the degree of Agency need for a language have offered two arguments in support of the proposition: First, some languages may be needed a little bit but not very much, e.g., Greek. Second, by so structuring the Program, there will be preserved greater flexibility for meeting unforeseeable needs of the future. I cannot responsibly accept either of these as adequate justification.

6. The first proposition, that some languages may be needed only a little bit, raises in essence a problem of quantitative control. This can and should be dealt with more simply, directly and positively by withdrawing a particular language from the list of awardable languages [] whenever the kind and quantity of competence achieved or in process of achievement is adequate to Agency requirements. I would condemn with no less conviction a proposition to pay Case Officers in SE Division less salary because fewer of them are needed or because their projects, in the over-all scheme of things, were needed less than those, say, of NEA. 25X1A

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

7. The other proposition, that greater flexibility may sometime be needed, reflects mere speculation and does not justify adopting a more complicated but less orderly standard than that of award based on effort. Flexibility is an attribute not an objective of this program. I believe the flexibility of a program that determines whether to grant awards for particular language competence from consideration of the Agency need for that language and then determines the amount of the award based solely on the relative effort required to achieve competence in that language is flexibility adequate for the stated objectives of the program. A program on these sound foundations has the additional virtue, always salutary even though not always necessary, of being equitable.

25X1A

8. With regard to [redacted] I dissent from the recommendation of the Committee for the reason that it establishes Greek as a Group I language. I have been advised by [redacted] that based solely on considerations of relative difficulty of learning, Greek would be awardable as a Group II language. [redacted] is qualified as an expert in such matters and has been serving the Committee as a consultant-advisor. A draft of [redacted] was considered by the Committee 16 January 1957, one day prior to consideration of [redacted] which actually provides the policy basis for classification of languages for award purposes. On 16 January, therefore, I outlined the reasons for my disapproval of that policy and also of proposed [redacted] to the extent that the latter included languages grouped for award purposes on considerations other than difficulty of learning. As a result of discussion I understood four essential points:

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

a. Of the languages listed, only Arabic was proposed for a language group (Group III) different than that to which it should be assigned based on difficulty (Group II)

25X1A

b. the DD/P and DD/I representatives agreed to publish [redacted] with Arabic in Group II.

c. all members of the Committee agreed that there was in fact no present need to group languages for award purposes on any basis other than difficulty of learning and hence the DD/S representative could concur in the proposed [redacted] as amended with respect to Arabic.

d. The DD/S representative alone opposed the policy basis for classification of languages for award purposes (para 2.b. of [redacted] which would be considered on the merits at the next meeting).

25X1A

9. My concurrence in the Committee recommendation regarding [redacted] was conditional upon my understanding and belief at that time that all languages included in [redacted] were grouped according to difficulty alone. Therefore, my concurrence although conditional actually was based upon a mistake of fact since Greek, a Group II language would be awardable only as a Group I language.

25X1A

CONFIDENTIAL

DD/S Member

~~SECRET~~